

and further recites that this prestored information is used to cancel or execute a facsimile communications operation using an optional frame with a calling facsimile machine.

The disclosure explains that “some manufacturers ... produce facsimile machines which may not conform to the common specifications of optional frames ... [and those] machines may cause a facsimile apparatus a problem in communication operations.” Page 3 at lines 15-20. To overcome the problem of using optional frames in a way that they should not be used, the patent specification describes examples in which the facsimile machine stores identification information of facsimile machines that have specifications of optional frames common therewith, so that a machine would know whether or not a calling machine in effect speaks the same language in terms of optional frames. Each of the two machines may be capable of using optional frames, but if they do not have common specifications of those frames, errors may ensue. Accordingly, the specification gives examples of how to avoid such errors by checking if the calling machine is on a list, at the first machine, of machines that have common specifications of optional frames with the first machine. If the answer is yes, facsimile communications *with optional frames* proceeds; if the answer is no, facsimile operations that would use optional frames are canceled.

The applied art does refer to optional frames but not to the way optional frames are used as disclosed and claimed in this patent application.

The primary reference, **Malik** U.S. Patent 5,991,290, as understood, uses a TSI data field to designate a destination terminal. The destination server extracts a subaddress from the TSI field and uses it to route the communication to a destination terminal that is within the server network and is designated by the subaddress. Nothing could be found in this reference

machines having common specifications of optional frames, and would use the stored information to execute of cancel communications operations depending on whether the information stored at the first machine tells that a calling machine has common specifications of optional frames.

Accordingly, applicant submits that although the applied art refers to optional frames, it does not teach or suggest the novel use of optional frames recited in the claims, and that the claims recite combinations of elements or steps that differ patentably from the applied prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent claims 1 and 4-6 are patentable over the cited art.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this response and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard F. Jaworski', written over a horizontal line.

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI

Reg. No.33,515

Attorney for Applicant

Cooper & Dunham LLP

Tel.: (212) 278-0400